REMARKS

Applicants have filed the present Amendment and Response in reply to the outstanding Final Official Action of May 26, 2006, and the Applicants believe the Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the Final Official Action for the reasons set forth below in greater detail.

At the onset, Applicants note that Claims 1-16 have been cancelled herewith. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejections of these claims are moot and will not be addressed.

Additionally, Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to speak with Applicants' representative to discuss the objection to Claim 40. During the discussion, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the objection to Claim 40 in view of the conversation. In sum, Claims 39 and 40 clearly recites that the one-to-one relationship is between the operational buttons and operations and not the individual codes and buttons. Each operating button can control only one operation, in each mode.

In the outstanding Final Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 16, 19, 22, 26, 29, 32, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenman et al. (hereafter "Stenman") in view of Shim (both references were previously cited).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections and traverse with at least the following analysis. Independent Claim 16 recites, *inter alia* storing a group of remote control codes for a predetermined controlling operation and transmitting to the target equipment the group of remote control codes for the predetermined control operation. Claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, storing various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship for various controlling

G:\NEC\1084\17160\Amend\17160.am3.doc

operations on the target equipment, and a part of remote control codes of a group of remote control codes for a predetermined controlling operation and transmitting the group of remote control codes formed by a remote control code associated with an operation button pressed by a user in advance and the part of remote control codes to perform the predetermined control operation. Claims 22, 26, 29, 32 and 36-38 recite ostensibly similar features. Applicants submit that Shim fails to teach the above-identified limitations.

Specifically, the references fail to teach storing a group of remote control codes for perform one predetermined control operation and transmitting the group for perform the predetermined control operation. As the Examiner correctly states, Shim teaches a data transmission method for a remote control for carrying out any desired **consecutive operation** which ordinarily would require key manipulation of the remote controller more than twice. "Accordingly, it is an object of the present invention to provide a data transmission method of a remote controller for consecutively supplying a plurality of data instructions for executing at least two consecutive operations of predetermined apparatus, wherein the data corresponding to an operation step of carrying out a successive multistage operation is set to be supplied in accordance with an input of a specific key, thereby consecutively outputting the instructions to execute the multistage operation in accordance with the specific key input." See Summary of the Invention. Thus one key could be used to turn on a VCR and provide the channel selection of the television, which the Examiner contends is equivalent to the claimed second mode. In other words, the same key can control two functions consecutively, i.e. assigning multiple individual codes to a single key for controlling multiple functions.

G:\NEC\1084\17160\Amend\17160.am3.doc

In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to having more than one data code or data instruction assigned to a button and grouped together and for performing **one controlling operation**. The groups of codes are stored in memory in advance. Each group of code is associated in a one-to-one relationship with an operating function of the target equipment. When an operator selects the group, the remote controller sequentially transmits each of the remote control codes in the select group to the target equipment. Therefore, one button on the remote controller controls one function of the target equipment in the second operation mode, i.e., one group of codes controls one function. For example, as described in the specification the group of codes can be used to program a VCR to record a television program. The transmission code group will include a time, channel, etc. The plurality of remote control codes which are the information for the recording of the television program define one transmission code group. Accordingly, Shim fails to teach storing a "group" of codes for performing on controlling operation, rather, Shim teaches storing multiple individual codes each for controlling one operation, i.e. multiple codes=multiple operations.

Similarly, Shim does not teach storing part of remote control codes of a group of remote control codes for a predetermined controlling operation and transmitting the group of remote control codes formed by part of the remote control codes corresponding to the operation button pressed by the user in advance of part of the remote control codes entered by the user. As described in the third mode of operation, the user can add certain information to the stored part of remote control codes, such as the hour, day, minute and year, which will correspond to the hour, day, minute and year code prestored in the group. Shim does not teach storing parts of a remote control group in memory, therefore,

G:\NEC\1084\17160\Amend\17160.am3.doc

Applicants submit that Claims 16, 19, 22, 26, 29, 32 and 36-38 are patentably distinct from the cited references as the references fail to teach, suggest or render obvious each and every limitation of the claims.

The Examiner also rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stenman, Shim and August. The Examiner also rejected Claims 18, 21, 25, 28, 31 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stenman, Shim and Wall. The Examiner also rejected Claims 20, 23, 24, 27, 30, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stenman, Shim and August. Additionally, the Examiner also rejected Claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Stenman, Shim and Wall. Lastly, the Examiner rejected Claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Stenman, Shim, Wall and Goldstein. Applicants respectfully disagree with each of the abovementioned rejections and traverse with at least the following analysis.

Applicants submit that none of the cited references, i.e. Wall, August, Goldstein, cure any of the deficiencies with respect to Shim and Stenman as set forth above. Specifically, none of the references teach storing a group of codes for an operating button to control one function.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 5, and 9 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw rejections of Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-40 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Additionally, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection of Claim 40.

In conclusion, the Applicants believe that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicit the Examiner to allow the

G:\NEC\1084\17160\Amend\17160.am3.doc

application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicants' attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

Seth Weinfeld
Registration No: 50,929

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343

SW:ej

G:\NEC\1084\17160\Amend\17160.am3.doc